

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. This amendment does not affect the scope of the claims. Accordingly, this amendment should be entered after final.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staples in view of Borst. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants claim a method for re-direction of a telecommunications link, which has been set up to a first telecommunications connection, to a second telecommunications connection within the public network. Information data, which reflects connection identification, is transmitted in parallel with user data via said telecommunications link. The first as well as the second telecommunications connection is connected to a respective first and second public switching center. Both the public switching centers are able to store the connection identification of the first telecommunications connection, the connection identification of the second connection, and status information. If according to the stored status information a re-direction is to be performed, the re-direction is done in the public switching center for the first telecommunications connection.

As described in the specification, the claimed method allows for the re-direction of a call directed to the first telecommunications connection in the public network without the re-direction being apparent to the calling party. For example, when a customer calls an employee of a company by dialing the employee's business extension, the call can be re-directed to a home office (private number) of that employee in the public network without the telephone number to which the call is re-directed being made apparent to the calling party.

Stapels describes a method for enabling a remote user to maintain a virtual presence at a corporate office including access to all facilities provides by the corporate office telephone system

and local area network (e.g. fax, e-mail, LAN-data, etc.), but the main aspect of the invention is that it provides the ability to receive home telephone calls on the same communication line used for the virtual presence connection to the corporate office.

Therefore a so called virtual presence server is used at the corporate office (see Fig. 1). This virtual presence is situated at a corporate office and therefore is not part of a public telecommunication network as claimed. This virtual presence server does all the call forwarding operations for the remote user - e.g. all calls to the remote user's office number are directed to the virtual presence server and then routed by the virtual presence server to the user's home telephone, which has to be connected to the user's remote computer system (see col. 25, lines 39-45). Accordingly, the user must be logged into the corporate network and therefore logged in at the virtual presence server for the incoming calls to be re-directed to his/her home office. The claimed method does not include or require the use of a virtual presence server outside of the communications network. In addition, the virtual presence server in Staples also does not offer any storage for identification and status information as claimed.

The Examiner relies upon Borst as disclosing storing information at a public switching center. Borst teaches a method of routing calls in an automatic call distribution network. Accordingly Borst simply generally describes an automatic call distribution (ACO) systems (e.g. call centers, telemarketing systems, etc.) and deals especially with the routing of calls among such systems.

The examiner does not specifically identify the reasons why one skilled in the art would have been motivated to select and combine the teachings of Staples and Borst—especially, since these two systems are unrelated. The Examiner simply states “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Borst into

the teachings of Staples for the purpose of saving cost for maintaining one database in the network over maintaining each individual database in each ACD.” The problem is that neither Staples nor Borst describe or suggest a method of redirecting calls utilizing a public switching center as claimed. In fact, as described above, Staples involves a method that specifically avoids utilizing a public switching center to redirect calls using a virtual presence server.

Since Staple and Borst fail to describe or suggest a the claimed method of redirecting telecommunications utilizing a public switching center as claimed, the rejection of claims 1-11 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **449122024700**.

Dated: December 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7769